



Dep A-2

UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20543

GENERAL GOVERNMENT
DIVISION

JAN 17 1967



The Honorable H. Guyford Stever
Chairman, Federal Coordinating Council
for Science, Engineering and Technology

Dear Dr. Stever:

I have reviewed the procedures followed by the Committee on Science and Technology Research (COSTR) in carrying out the functions assigned to the Executive branch under Section 303 of the National Defense Education Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352). These assigned functions are described in the document and I enclose the effectiveness of the National Defense Education Act of 1964. Although our review focused on the activities of COSTR, we also considered those of other Federal agencies involved in science and technology activities, including the National Science Foundation.

In general, the following observations were made:
1. The Executive branch has been able to meet the requirements of the National Defense Education Act of 1964 in carrying out its responsibilities under the Act.
2. The Executive branch has been able to meet the requirements of the National Defense Education Act of 1964 in carrying out its responsibilities under the Act.
3. The Executive branch has been able to meet the requirements of the National Defense Education Act of 1964 in carrying out its responsibilities under the Act.
4. The Executive branch has been able to meet the requirements of the National Defense Education Act of 1964 in carrying out its responsibilities under the Act.
5. The Executive branch has been able to meet the requirements of the National Defense Education Act of 1964 in carrying out its responsibilities under the Act.

We believe that improvements are needed in the procedures followed by the Executive branch in carrying out the requirements of the National Defense Education Act of 1964 in carrying out its responsibilities under the Act. We would appreciate your attention to the matter of action. We will bring our observations to your attention for consideration during your review.

Very truly yours,

John R. Gandy, Jr., in order to assist the Office of Science and Technology and the Federal Council for Science and Technology in fulfilling their responsibility for the agency coordinate ap-

of water resources research. CWRR's role is to coordinate the Nation's many and diverse water research activities conducted at the various departments and agencies within the Federal Government involved in water resources research. Within these departments and agencies, 23 distinct organizations either conduct or sponsor water resources research.

The Federal water research budget for these organizations has increased from \$4.7 million in fiscal year 1963 to an estimated \$214 million for fiscal year 1970 (as reported to GOL by the individual GOLR - DRI). Since current Federal spending for water research and development is so large, the interagency coordination of federal water resources research funds and assignments is essential.

In the Water Research Research Act of 1964 the Congress stipulated that the President should clarify agency responsibilities for Federal water resources research and to make recommendations for implementation of interagency coordination of such research. In addition, the law stated that such coordination should include:

- Identification of critical needs in various water resources research categories;
- Establishment of the priority of the various water resources research categories;
- Establishment of the basic organization for the administration of water resources research;
- Identification of the specific research objectives and priorities for each category of research;
- Establishment of the research methods for carrying out the specified research categories;
- Establishment of the management techniques to promote the efficiency of the various water resources research categories;
- Establishment of the research methods for identifying the technical personnel of the priority areas;
- Establishment of the management techniques to promote the efficiency of the various water resources research categories.

These functions are best to entrust of the seven functions assigned to GOLR if it is established.

Effectively, GOLR carries out the responsibility of carrying out the coordination of the Federal program for Science and Technology. On March 11, 1970, the GOLR selected the National Science and Technology Policy

Organization, and Priorities Act of 1974 (P.L. 94-212). This law established the Federal Coordinating Council for Science, Engineering, and Technology (FCCST) to replace the Federal Council for Science and Technology. The 1976 act did not affect section 305 of the 1964 act and that section is still in effect. It will now be titled as its functions under the direction of FCCST.

We found that COAL had addressed all first four functions, mentioned above, while addressing very little of the fifth and fourth, the other three. COAL did not propose solutions for the last two functions. We asked COAL to draw up an action plan for carrying out the missing functions. The Director of COAL told us that little attention had been given to the last three functions because of staff and funding limitations. The Director also said by COAL to carry out the other four functions, we are to take steps

The Clark County cold case unit, circa 1994, obtained information obtained from its annual reports on its investigation of the 1970-1971 serial murders. The first six reports covered the period of time the investigation had been open, and were never to have been made public. The seventh report, regarding the 1970-1971 serial murders, was released to the public in 1997, as the county's attorney's office changed its reporting laws. Since that time, the county has compiled a number of reports, except for one, and intend to release them to the public.

We further conclude that the information which should be included to evaluate the adequacy of research programs should be annual reports issued in evaluation of the adequacy of the research conducted to date. Also, the reports should be made publically available. For example, the 1971 report was issued in May 1972 and the 1972 report was issued three months later. If the reports are to be kept up to date, care for data and progress in evaluating such activities of the various laboratories and industry should be taken and should include an analysis of the adequacy of the research being conducted.

IDENTIFICATION AND ELIMINATION OF FALSE TESTS AND OTHERS IN THE USEAGE OF JOY PROGRAMS

Comptons as a research classification system as its primary means of identifying duplication and overlaps. Our review indicated that the system is not adequate to serve its intended purpose. For each annual report, Comptons uses ten major categories and 60 subcategories to classify the individual project expenditures. (Individual projects are not listed). The categorized lists are then submitted to two high-level review teams for indications of duplication or overlap.

Congress' classification categories do not adequately reflect all varieties of timber found in the forests. For example, an official from the B.S.A. recently told us that much of the forest growth is not easily categorized because the categories are not adequately defined. Other agency officials told us that since their research usually fits into more than one category, they arbitrarily file their research to several categories. Since the classification system is not designed to accommodate overlapping applications of categories, the classification may be inaccurate and inconsistent.

More recently, it has been found that the same general principles apply to the study of the organic compounds of the elements. It is now known that the properties of the organic compounds of the elements are determined mainly by the nature of the element and the number of atoms of the element in the molecule. The number of atoms of the element in the molecule is called the valence of the element.

Guidelines also call for that they have to take an orally written survey and submit the written application to the Board every year. The Board will receive a copy of each survey from each activity at roughly quarterly intervals. About four months are required to review the responses received by all agencies. The Board has the right to inspect and review every 3-5 years. If the practice may be continued for 4 years no additional orally meetings were conducted. We believe that GAO should consider reinstating the oral review of each agency's research activities as they would be more transparent, more efficient, and provide a better understanding of the exact nature of the activities.

IDENTIFICATION OF TECHNICAL
NEEDS IN VARIOUS WATER RESOURCE
RESEARCH PROGRAMS

In 1966, COMRR issued a report entitled "A Ten-year Program of Federal Water Resources Research." This report presented a basis for long-term planning of a research program; a discussion of 14 major water research problem areas and recommendations for research in each area; a description of then-current programs; divided into nine major research categories and 34 research subcategories; as well as recommendations for the size and scope of research work for each subcategory and for increased expenditure levels for the five-year period 1967 to 1971 inclusive. The ten-year program did not contain specific recommendations as to which agency should be responsible for performing specific research assignments or as to individual agency expenditure levels.

COMRR's 1970 annual report discussed the need for revision of the ten-year program because new problems were emerging, existing research requirements had been satisfied to some extent, the recommended general congressional budget level in the ten-year program did not go beyond 1967, and shorter term had been identified in the ten-year program. The 1970 report identified the problem areas and five specific problem areas. General funds for developing the revised program were not available.

Given the opportunity, the development of a five-year water resources research plan would be feasible during the next five-year period. Other agencies should identify the various factors in research planning and recommend expenditure levels for research efforts. The task could be completed by the end of May, 1972.

COMRR has suggested to the agency heads for consideration the extent to which the program should be continued for the five-year period. We believe that such a plan would be useful and should provide a means for obtaining current research information to aid in determining which agencies are conducting research in specific areas, identifying the areas of greatest concern, providing assistance to assess the impact of research activities, and keeping the program up-to-date.

ACTIVITIES OF THE COORDINATING COMMITTEE
COMRR

COMRR facilitates its inter-agency or joint committee primarily through monthly meetings. These meetings provide a forum for discussion among the members. At these meetings agency officials are informed of new

developments in their fields and in other interdisciplinary areas relating to water resources research as well as notification of new publications, upcoming seminars, or agency annual meetings which the members can attend.

Minutes of the meetings are sent to all members. For those who do not attend a meeting, the COARR Chairman said that the minutes are one way of learning what transpired at the meeting and of keeping abreast of current developments in the water area.

However, our review indicated that the minutes contained comments mainly on reorganizations, reassessments, and recent publications. For example, in the period from September 1974 to January 1976, agencies' research projects or programs were mentioned in only seven instances. Also, the minutes contained very little detailed information of what transpired at the meeting.

Occasionally, the COARR Chairman also establishes ad hoc work groups or task forces to facilitate interagency coordination. The work groups study specific, relevant problem areas and write a report which is circulated to COARR members for comment and discussion. The chairman stated that he felt the completed documents have contributed to interagency coordination.

We believe COARR could better facilitate interagency coordination by encouraging the publication of research projects currently meeting and being developed in the course of the meeting.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Because of the large number of federal departments and agencies involved, and the fact that in the last year or so federal interest in water resources research has declined, we believe it is important that improvements be made in the procedures followed by COARR to ensure the coordination and effectiveness of such activities. Therefore, we recommend that COARR:

- Prepare for its publication and action plan for carrying out each of the responsibilities set forth in Section 305 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1964.
- Identify its activities in a more timely manner and include in such reports the results of the continuing analysis of the adequacy of research being conducted by the various Federal agencies.

--Improve its research classification system so that it is sufficiently comprehensive, and define the categories clearly enough to provide information needed to assist in identifying and eliminating duplication and overlap. In addition, reinstitute the oral review process during the monthly meetings at which each member agency's research activities are reviewed.

--Design and implement a monitoring system for ascertaining the extent to which its recommended program for water resource research is implemented in the budget process. Such system should provide for obtaining current information needed to add an element which agencies are conducting research in specific problem areas, identifying those areas needing more research, proposing actions to assist the participant in research activities, and keeping the program up-to-date.

--Establish a procedure of classification of research projects at suitable meetings, and prepare one detailed directory of such findings.

We enclose three copies of this report to those Federal agencies which have requested them or otherwise indicated.

Upon receipt of your comments, we will consider the changes you have suggested and make any necessary modifications. We would appreciate your comments by January 15, 1978. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Charles J. Gaffey, Director, DPA.

Very truly yours,

Charles J. Gaffey
Assistant Director